

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of July 26, 2007, claims 1, 8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention with respect to the limitation of “*the time differential between said predefined moment and each of said transmission start moments includes the sum of a common discrete delay period and a number of waiting time periods.*” Claim 16 was also apparently rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Furthermore, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,187,692 B1 (“Ooya et al.”).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 to overcome the section 112, second paragraph, rejections. In claims 1, 8, 12 and 16, the limitation of “*the time differential between said predefined moment and each of said transmission start moments includes the sum of a common discrete delay period and a number of waiting time periods*” has been deleted. Thus, the section 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 are now moot. As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

In addition, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Ooya et al. In particular, the limitations of “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined moment, where the number of waiting time periods is defined from the end of the common selectable discrete time period*” have been added to claims 1, 8, 12 and 16. Support for this claim amendment can be found at least in Fig. 3 and page 9, lines 23-25. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., as explained below. In view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of the amended

independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16, as well as the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 8, 12 and 16

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined moment, where the number of waiting time periods is defined from the end of the common selectable discrete time period,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Ooya et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on page 11 asserts that the cited reference of Ooya et al. discloses “a time delay between the first time slot and the received signal 191.” However, this time delay is not described as being “selectable.” Thus, the cited reference of Ooya et al. does not disclose “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined moment,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1.

In addition, as correctly stated on page 12 of the Office Action, the cited reference of Ooya et al. describes that the slave stations “wait for their slot number” and “after that an extra time delays in each time slot is waited (number of waiting time periods) (see fig. 3; also see col. 4, lines 44-57).” Consequently, these extra time delays are defined from the beginning of each time slot, not “*from the end of the common selectable discrete time period,*” as recited in the amended independent claim

1. Thus, the cited reference of Ooya et al. does not disclose “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined moment, where the number of waiting time periods is defined from the end of the common selectable discrete time period*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., and request that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 be allowed as well.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Breitfuss et al.

Date: February 27, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300